

A True  
A C C O U N T  
AND  
CONFUTATION  
OF THE  
DOCTRINE  
OF THE  
SABELLIANS.

*Marcellus nunc Sabellii, nunc autem Pauli Samosatani  
Hæresin renovare tentat, μὴν ἃ ὁμοῦσαν τρεῖς ἡ-  
σαν, ὡς περ καὶ τριῶν ἑσῶν, &c. Eusebius Eccles.  
Theol. l. 3. c. 6. p. 165.*

*Dr Whitby*

L O N D O N.

Printed for John Baker, at the Black-Boy in  
Pater-Noster-Row. MDCCXVI.

Price Six Pence.

1797

THE

OF

THE

THE

THE

THE



A True  
 ACCOUNT  
 AND  
 CONFUTATION  
 OF THE  
*Doctrine of the Sabellians.*

CHAP. I.

*Concerning the Opinion of the Sabellians.*



OR the right Explication of the Doctrine of *Noetus* and *Sabellius*, and of *Marcellus*, who by *Eusebius* is often charged with the same Doctrine which *Sabellius* held; it is observable,

1<sup>st</sup>. That the *Sabellians* asserted an *αὐτὴν, ἡ ταὐ-  
 τήτης*, that is, a Sameness or Identity of the Es-  
 sence of God the Father, and the Son. Hence,



saith *Eusebius*, it is manifest that *Marcellus* fell into the Opinion of *Sabellius*, because he affirmed that the Son (a) was of the same Essence and Hypostasis with the Father. *Athanasius* also saith, (b) We do not think the Father and the Son to be *ἁπορίσθη* of the same Essence, or Substance; as the Sabellians do. And *Epiphanius* speaks thus (c), We do not affirm the Son to be *ταυτοῦτον* of the same Substance with the Father; lest That Word, used by some, should render us like to Sabellius. And yet, in the same Place, he affirms him to be *ταυτόν τῇ οὐσίᾳ*, the same in Substance, and so in Reality doth not differ from him.

2dly. It likewise is observable from all the Fathers, that *Sabellius* by his Opinion did *ἀναιρεῖν τὴν ὑπόστασιν* destroy the Hypostasis, that is, the Substance, or singular Existence of the Son. Thus *Origen*, having cited these Words of Christ, *I and my Father are one*; and his Prayer, that the Disciples might be one, as *I, Father, am in thee, and thou in me*; declares that it ought not to be conceived that he favoured the Opinion of those Men who denied the Father and the Son (d) *δύο ἢ ὑποστάσεις* to be two singular Hypostases; or, as he soon after adds, to be *δύο ὑποστάσεις πνεύματων* two things in Hypostasis, or as to their particular Existences. And *St. Basil* adds, that the Word *ὁμοῦσι* corrected the Error of Sabellius;

(a) *Ἐν τῇ ἡ* καὶ ταυτόν οὐσίᾳ, καὶ ὑποστάσει, τῷ Θεῷ. *Contra Marcellum*. l. 1. p. 5.

(b) *Οὐτὲ γὰρ οὐτοῦ πάτερ φρονέμεν ὡς οἱ Σαβέλλιοι μαρτυροῦσιν*. *Expos. Fidei*. p. 241.

(c) *Καὶ ὁ λέγομεν πνεύσιον* *Har.* 76. N. 7.

(d) *L. 8. Contra Cellsum*, p. 385, 386.



for, saith he, ἀφαιρῶ τὴν ταυτότητα τὴν ὁμοειδήν, it removes or takes away the Identity of Hypostasis ; for (e) the same thing is not consubstantial to its self, but one thing to another. Whence it evidently follows, that the Essence, or Substance of the Father, must be a distinct Thing from the Substance of the Son : Hypostasis, only in the late Acceptation of the Word, signifying not one Thing, but merely one Mode of its Existence.

3dly. Hence also the Fathers observed, that, according to the Doctrine of Sabellius, Christ differ'd from the Father rather in Name, than Nature ; and that, by making him one in Substance and Hypostasis with the Father, they left him only the Name of God, but denied him to have any proper Substance or Hypostasis. Thus Origen saith, that him whom they stiled God, they owned to be another from the Father in Name, but denied him to have (f) ἰδιώματα ἑτέραν, his proper Being, distinct from that of the Father. That this is the true Import of these Words, is evident from This, that Origen held the Son to be (g) ἕτερον εἶδος, of a distinct Essence from the Father, and so to have ἰδίαν εἰδίαν, a proper Essence of his own. In his Commentary on St. Matthew, He ranks the Sabellians among those who spake false Things of God, (h) and confounded the Conception of the Father and the

(e) 'Οὐ γὰρ αὐτὸ τὸ εἶναι ἑαυτοῦ ὁμοείδους, ἀλλ' ἕτερον ἑτέρου. Epist. 300. p. 292, 293.

(f) Com. in Johan. p. 45.

(g) Hæc ἐν χη. p. 48.

(h) Ὅποιοι εἰσιν οἱ συγχέοντες πατέρας καὶ υἱὸν ἑννοίαν, καὶ τὴν ὑποστασιν εἶνα διδόντες εἶναι τὸ πατέρα καὶ τὸ υἱόν, τῇ ἐμνοία μόνῃ καὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος διακρίντες τὸ ἐν ὑποκρίματον. p. 470.

Son, that is, made them one in *Hypostasis*, dividing the one Subject in Conceptions only and in Names : And also faith of Some, (i) they do not shew, whether, being one in *Hypostasis*, they had only two Conceptions, manifested by two Names; or whether δύο πράγματα, two Things, could be expressed by them; they being (saith he elsewhere) δύο ὑποστάσεις πράγματα, two Things in Subsistence. And Eusebius saith, that Marcellus making the Father and the Son to be different Names, but one οὐσία καὶ ὑπόστασις in Essence and Subsistence; did manifestly hold the Doctrine of Sabellius. *Ibid.* l. 1. p. 5.

4thly. Eusebius expressly affirms, that Sabellius was cast out of the Church as a Blasphemer, for daring to assert that Christ was The God over all.

5thly, It is observable that all the Antenicene Greek Fathers who writ against Sabellius, not only maintained that God the Son was ἕτερος οὐσία, ἀειδαμὸς καὶ ὑπόστασις another in Substance, Number, and Singular Existence from the Father; but also denied that he was The Supreme God, or God over all. The Opinion which now passes under the Name of Sabellius, was older than either Sabellius or Noetus, or even (k) Justin; who mentions it, as making "That Son, whom the Prophet called God, "only the Power of God expressed by divers "Names, and exerting its self by Actions, and "then returning into the Essence of the Father."

(i) Οὐ συνιστάντες ὅτε εἰ δύο ἐπινοίας ἔχει δηλωθῆας διὰ τῶν δύο ὀνομασιῶν, ἐν τῇ ὑπόστασις τυγχανόντων· ἢ εἰ δύναται καὶ δύο δηλωθῆαι ἐν ταῖς πράγματι. p. 485.

(k) Dial. p. 35.

To this he opposes his own Opinion, that *the Power which the propheticall Language called God, and which was the  $\alpha\beta\gamma\theta$ , was not  $\delta\eta\lambda\omega\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu, \alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\eta\delta\eta\mu\acute{o}\varsigma\ \eta\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \pi$ , in Name only, but in Number also, another Thing from the Father; even as he often doth assert and prove,  $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\ \tau\acute{o}\ \pi\omicron\iota\omicron\iota\tau\acute{\epsilon}\ \tau\acute{o}\nu\ \delta\lambda\omega\nu$ , another from the Maker of all Things. Origen was another Adversary to this Doctrine; and he, in Opposition to it, asserts that the Father and the Son were two Things in Hypostasis; (l) that the Generality of Christians did not believe the Son to be The God over all; (m) that he was of distinct Essence from the Father, and not to be compared with him in Essence, Dignity, Power and Divinity, Their third Adversary was Dionysius Alexandrinus, who (saith St Basil) out of his Zeal to contradict Sabellius, laid the Seeds of the Heresie of the (n) Anomœans, asserting in the sacred Trinity a Diversity of Substance, a Diminution of Power, and a Diversity of Glory. The fourth was (o) Gregory Thaumaturgus; who (saith St Basil) in his Disputation with Ælian, spake those Things (of Christ)*

(1) Esto non deesse in Multitudine credentium & inter se discrepantium, quosdam δια τὴν ποσότητα ὑποπίδεσθαι, ἢ Σωτῆρα ἢ ἐπὶ πάντι Θεόν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ γὰρ ἡμῖς &c. contr. Celsus, l. 8. p. 387.

(m) Ὁ τοσούτων καὶ πηλικύτων ὑπάρχον ἐσὶ καὶ πρεσβεία καὶ δύναμις, καὶ θεοότης, ἐσυγκρίνεται καὶ ἐδίδεν πρὸ πάντων. Com. in Johan. p. 218.

(n) Καὶ ἔχ' ἐτερότητα μόνον τῶν ὑποστάσεων πίνεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ-  
σίας διαφορὰν, καὶ συνάμεικτος ὕρξεσιν, καὶ ὁδῶν παραλλαγῇ. Epist.  
41. p. 60.

(ο) Πολλὰς μὲν εὐχὰς ἔχει φωνὰς τὰς τοῖς νῦν Ἀρετικοῖς μεγίστην ἰσχὺν παρεχομένας, ὡς τὸ κλῖσμα, καὶ ποίημα, καὶ ἡ τοιοῦτον. *Epist.*, 64. p. 151.

*which*



which afford the greatest Strength to our present Hereticks.

6thly. It is a Thing still more observable in this Case, that both the same and other Fathers, in their Disputes against the Doctrine of Sabellius, answer the great Objection of Sabellius, that the Opinion of his Adversaries introduced two or three Gods; not by saying, with the Post-Nicene Fathers, that God the Father and the Son were one and the same God; but by asserting that their Doctrine did not introduce two Gods, because the Father and the Son was not of the same singular Essence; that the Son was not equal to the Father; that he was not of equal Honour with him, but Subordinate to him; an Image of him; and therefore God, because He was in all things made like unto him. If, saith (p) Tertullian, Christ had said, *I and the Father are Unus*; That might have favoured their Opinion; because That bears the Signification of the Singular Number, [and doth not one numerical Essence do the same?] But he only saith, *Unum sumus, we are one Thing*: Which belongs not to Singularity, but to Unity, to Similitude, to Conjunction, to the Obedience of the Son who obeys the Will of the Father: By saying, *I and the Father are One*, he shews Two, whom He equals and joins. Now whatsoever here He intends by Unity, He cannot mean Unity in one and the same

---

(p) Unum sumus, quod non pertinet ad singularitatem, sed ad unitatem, ad similitudinem, ad conjunctionem & ad obsequium filii, qui voluntari Patris obsequitur; unum sumus, dicens, Ego & Pater, ostendit duos esse quos æquat & jungit. *Advers. Prax.*

*individual Essence; seeing That cannot be like, equal, or join'd to it self, and much less can it obey the Will of another. Novatian's Book de Trinitate, is writ against the Opinion of the same Persons: And He not only doth assert that Christ, tho' He was God, yet never took upon him to aver that he was equal with the Father; and that the Son of God, was so God, as (q) not depriving the Father of his Title of being the One and Only God; But, in Answer to this Objection of the Sabellians, he saith that therefore He introduced not two Gods, because He did not assert them to be equal; for had he done this, he had given just Ground for the Controversy which they feign of two Gods.*

*Origen endeavours to remove the Scruple of those who did not willingly own Christ to be God, ὑπαβέμνοι δὺο ἀναγορεύσαι Θεὸς; as fearing to assert there were two Gods; by this Distinction, that when the Apostle speaks of Him who is αὐτοθεός; God of, and from himself, He styles him ἰ Θεός; God with an Article; and therefore our Saviour in his Prayer to his Father, saith, That they may know Thee ὁ μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν the only true God: But Any besides him who is God of himself, being made God (r) by Participation of His Divinity,*

---

(q) Ut non eripiens illud Patri, quod unus & solus sit; Par enim inventus, merito dicimus duorum Deorum quam ipsi confingunt controversiam suscitasset Cap. 31.

(r) μετοχῇ ἢ ἐκείνου Θεότητος, Com. in Joban. Hæretici superstitiose magis quam Religiose, ne videantur duos Deos dicere, neq; rursus negare salvatoris Divinitatem; unam eandemq; Substantiam patris & filii asseverant. Idem Com. in Titum apud Pamphilum Apol. F. 162. Col. 1.

is not God with an Article, but more properly may be call'd Gods, God without an Article; And thus, saith he, besides the true God there be many Gods *ἡμετέραν τὴν Θεὸν ὡμολογῶν* being made such by Participation of God: But tho' there be many Gods, yet to us (Christians) there is but one God, the Father; and tho' there be many Lords, yet to us there is but one Lord (to wit) Jesus Christ.

Lastly. Eusebius Casariensis speaks still more fully to this Subject. For he not only saith that the Father only was the one true God, and the Son was (f) *ἰσὶα καὶ δύναμις ἀσώματος καὶ ἀπείρου* diverse in Essence and Power from God the Father; and that these things were said Rightly, and according to the Opinion of the Church; and that no Man can be Pious, who affirms that the Son is The God over all. But adds, that tho' the Church calls the Father God, and the Son God, She doth not introduce two Gods, but makes the Father the One only God: For where there is but one only Principle, and one Head, (God being the Head of Christ) how can there be two Gods, and not One only; even He who only hath no Superiour, nor any other Cause of himself; who challengeth as his own, peculiar and Unbegotten Godhead with Monarchical Power?

He adds, that tho' they assert two Hypostases, they do not own them to be (t) *ἰσόμενοι* of equal Honour, but hold that the Son worships, Adores,

(f) L. 1. contr. Marcell. p. 29. 27. Eccl. Theol. l. 1. c. 7.

(t) 'Οὐδὲ δὴ οὗτος ἀδελφὸν δέσσει καὶ τὰς δὴ οὐκ ἰσόμενοι αὐτὸς δεῖξιναι. Eusebius Ecclesiast. Theol. l. 2. c. 7.



and honours his Father, styling him his God. And lastly, that by this the Church did not own two Gods, because she did not own two Substances (u) of equal Honour one to another, but declared One Principle and God, to wit the Father of the only Son; The only Wise God, 1 Tim. 1, 17; the blessed and only Potentate, who only hath Immortality, Chap. 6. 15, 16.

Now I enquire, 1st, How one and the same numerical Essence communicated to the Son by internal Generation, and to the Holy Ghost by internal Spiration, otherwise differs from itself, than τὴν ἐννοίαν in Conception? which Difference, saith Origen, the Noetians owned, Or,

2dly, How the same numerical Essence in the Father, can differ from the same numerical Essence communicated to the Son and the Holy Ghost, otherwise then τὴν ὁμοίαν in Manner of Existence? which yet to say, in the Opinion of the Learned Bishop Bull, is pure Sabellianism. Chap. 4. p. 439.

3dly, I inquire in what Text of Scripture it is said, or from what Words it may be prov'd, that the Son and Holy Ghost, derive the same Individual Essence ἐξ ὧν τὸ πᾶν from the Essence of the Father, or have the same individual Essence with him.

4thly, Seeing Dr. Cudworth hath fully proved, that Hypostasis, in the Sense of the Antient Fa-

---

(u) Οὐ δύο θεοὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία θεὸν ἀνέστη, — — — δύο ὧν ἑστὶ ἐξ ἑστέρας ἀντιπαρεξαρτήσας ἀλλήλοις ἑσάγον. Ibid. Cap. 23.

thers, is only an existent Essence ; and that *οὐσία* did with them signify a common Essence or a Specifick Essence, in which all Individuals agreed ; and (x) *Huetius* declares, " That in " Antient times *ὑπόστασις* was used for *οὐσία* Es-  
 " sence or Substance, both by *Heathens* and *Chri-*  
 " *stians* ; " and to this effect cites these Words of *St. Jerom*, that " The whole School of Secu-  
 " lar Learning knew they were one and the  
 " same Thing : " The *Sabellians*, by taking away  
 the Hypostasis of the Son, and making him  
 to be ἐν τῇ ὑποστάσει one in *Hypostasis* with the  
 Father, must take away the Essence of the Son ;  
 And the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, by asserting that  
 the Father and the Son had two Hypostases,  
 and were δύο ὑποστάσεις πρῶτα two Things in *Hyp-*  
*postasis*, must assert that they had two distinct  
 Essences.

5thly, If, as *Eusebius* affirms, *Sabellius* was Cast  
 out of the Church as a Blasphemer, for saying  
 that *the Son was the God over all* ; How will  
 they who make that very Thing for which he  
 was Condemn'd, an Article of their Faith, es-  
 cape the like Condemnation ?

---

(x) ὑπόστασις pro οὐσία priscis temporibus solebat usurpari ab  
 Ethnicis & Christianis. Hieronymus Epist. 57. ad Damasum, tota  
 secularium literarum Schola nihil aliud ὑπόστασιν nisi οὐσίαν novit. Ita  
 sumserunt Nicæni patres, ita Sardicenses ; origenian, l. 2. qu. 2. p. 32.  
 οὐσία, ἡ φύσις, ἡ μορφή καὶ τὸς ἀγίους πατέρας ταύτων ἐστὶν ἡ πάλιν  
 ὑπόστασις ἡ προσωπον ἡ ἀπειρον ταύτων ἐστὶν. ὥστε φύσις ἡ μορφή ἡ  
 οὐσία ἐστὶν τὸ κοινόν, ἐκείνων τὰς ὁμοουσίους ὑποστάσεις. ὑπόστασις δὲ,  
 ἡ ἀίδιμον, ἡ προσωπον, τὸ μετέκον. ut singulæ res quæ sub eadem  
 specie continentur. Damascen. Primæ institut. c. 1. 2. p. 460, 461.  
 vid. c. 7. p. 464.

If from *Justin* to the very Time of the *Nicene-Council*, all the *Greek-Fathers* who wrote against *Sabellius*, held, in opposition to him, that the Son of God was not The Supreme God, or the God over all, but that he was distinct in Number, and in Substance from him; adding that they affirmed this rightly & *κατασκευαστικῶς*, suitably to the Doctrine of the Church; could the Church then maintain that the Father and the Son were of the same numerical Essence?

6thly, And Lastly, Do not their Answers to the capital Objection of the *Sabellians*, by denying an Equality and Parity of Substance and of Honour betwixt God the Father and the Son; and their express Sayings that they owned only *one God*, to wit the Father; seem to demonstrate a Signal Difference betwixt the Doctrine of the *Ante-Nicene* and *Post-Nicene Fathers*, and that the first were as Rank *Hereticks* as *Dr. Clarke* and *Mr. Jackson*, or that some others are Rank *Sabellians*.

I Conclude this Chapter in the Words of the very Learned (s) *Dr. Cudworth*; "That when this Trinity of three Hypostases, and one specifick Essence, came afterwards to be decryed as *Tritheistick*, there started up, in the Room of it, the other Trinity of Persons numerically the same, or having one and the same singular existent Essence; which



“ seems not to have been own'd by any public Authority in the Church, save that of the *Lateran Council* only.”

And again, “ The Orthodox *Anti-Arian Fathers* did all of them zealously Condemn *Sabellianism*; the Doctrine whereof is no other than this, that there was but one Hypostasis or singular Individual Essence of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and consequently that they were indeed but three several Names, or Notions, or Modes of one and the self-same Thing; from whence such Absurdities as these would follow, that the Father's begetting the Son, was nothing but one Name, Notion, or Mode of the Deity's begetting another, or else the same Deity under one Notion begetting itself under another Notion; and when again the Son, or Word, is said to have been Incarnate, and to have suffered Death for us upon the Cross, that it was nothing but a Mere logical Notion or Mode of the Deity that was Incarnate and suffered, or else the whole Deity under one particular Notion or Mode only. But should it be averred notwithstanding, that this Trinity which we speak of, was not a Trinity of mere Names or Notions, as that of the *Sabellians*, but of distinct Hypostases, or Persons; then must it needs follow (since every singular Essence is an Hypostasis according to the Sense of the Antient Fathers,) that there was not a Trinity only, but Quaternity of Hypostases in the Deity; which is a thing that none of those

" those Fathers never dreamt of, *Ibid.* page 605.

## C H A P. II.

### A Confutation of the Sabellian Opinion.

NOW that I may more evidently confute this Doctrine, I shall lay down several Propositions of unquestionable Truth. *viz.*

1<sup>st</sup>, That (a) where the numerical Essence is one and the same, the Will and Actions of that Essence must be one and the same; for *actiones sunt essentiae*; And since an all-perfect Being hath no Accident, it can act only by its Essence. And where the Will and Actions are numerically distinct or diverse, there the Individual Essence must also be distinct and different. And This, *Damascen* declares to be the Doctrine of the Holy Fathers.

Hence it demonstratively follows, that if the Essence of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, be numerically one and the same; the Will and all the other Actions of these Three, must be numerically one and the same; So that what the *Father* wills or doth, the Son and Holy Ghost must ~~will~~ will and do also; and what the Son

(a) *καὶ τὰς πατέρας ὅν τὸ θέλημα ἐν, τέτων καὶ ἡ ὁσία μία.* Damasc. orthod. Fidei l. 3. c. 14. p. 220. *οἱ πατέρες οἱ ἄλλοι ἔρασαν, ὅν ἡ ὁσία μία, τέτων καὶ ἐνέργεια μία. καὶ ὅν διδωσας ἡ ὁσία, τέτων διδωσας καὶ ἡ ἐνέργεια.* c. 15 p. 231. c. 19, p. 255. *ἐν αἰὶ πάντως καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ θέλημα ἐν ὅλη τῇ ἀγίᾳ τριάδι.* Cyril Alex. Com. in Johan. l. 4. p. 333.

wills and doth, the Father and the Holy Ghost must will and do.

2dly, When the Son is said to come or to be sent down from *Heaven* or from *his Father* which is in *Heaven*; this must necessarily be understood, not of his Humane Nature, which never was in Heaven till after his Resurrection it ascended thither; but (b) of his Divine Nature. Now hence arise these Arguments against the *Sabellian* Doctrine.

1st. He that hath the same numerical Essence with God the Father, must always have the same numerical Will with God the Father; and what the Father wills, He must will also; and the Will of the Father must be his own Will. But this is inconsistent with these Words of Christ, *John* 5, 30. (b2) *I seek not mine own Will, but the Will of the Father which sent me*: And Chap. 6. 38, *I came down from Heaven, not that I might do my own Will, but the will of him that sent me*: And Chap. 4, 34, *My Meat is, that I may do the will of him that sent me, and that I may finish his Work*. For can the

(b) ὁ δὲ καταβάς ἐκ τῆς ἑρανῆς, ὁ Ψιλὸς ἀνθρώπος δὴ πῶς ἦν, ἀλλὰ Θεὸς καταβάς ἐξ ἑρανῆς ὡς Θεὸς δηλονότι *Theophylact*. Et quomodo in cœlum quā homo ascendit, sic inde qua Deus, ante descendit. *Novatian de Trin. Cap. xi. & Cap. 22, 23.*

(b 2) ἔπερον ἰαυτὸν τῆ πατρὸς δέκνυται διὰ τῆς ἐζητῶ τοῦ θέλημα τοῦ ἑωὺν, ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τῆς πικυφαντὸς με. καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἑρανῆς κατὰ πηλυδῆναι, ἐκ ἵνα ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα ἑαυτῆς, ἀλλὰ τῆς πικυφαντὸς αὐτόν. *Euseb. Eccles. Theol. l. 2. c. 7. p. 110.* At juxta Sabellium, αὐτὸς ἔστι ὁ ἐυχόμενος ἑαυτῶ, καὶ ἀπεσάλλεται λέγων ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς. *Ibid. cap. 12. p. 119.* Nec suam, sed patris perfecit voluntatem, *Tertull. adv. Prax. Cap. 8.*

same



same numerical Essence send it self, and be sent by it self, and become its own Legate? Or can He that hath the same numerical Will with the Father, *come down from Heaven, not to do his own Will?* When he saith, *Luke 22, 42, Father, if thou wilt, let this Cup pass from me, nevertheless not my Will but thine be Done;* is it reasonable here to admit the Gloss of *Damascene*, (c) *not my Humane will, but thine, that is, my Divine Will be done?*

2dly, Where the Individual Essence is one and the same, the Actions of the same Essence must be one and the same; so that what is done by the Father, must be done by the same Individual Essence of the Son, provided Both have one Essence. And yet this also seems plainly Inconsistent with the Words of Christ, and with the Declarations of the *Holy Scripture*: As when Christ saith, *my Doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me*, Joh. 7. 16. Again, Chap. 12. 49, 50. *The Father which sent me, (d) he gave me a Commandment what I should say, and what I should speak; The Things which I speak, as the Father hath given me a Commandment, so I speak.*

---

(c) καὶ τὸ ἐμὸν γένεσθαι θέλημα, ἢ τοι καὶ ὁ ἐπεμψὺς ἐμὴ ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν. ἢ τοι τὸ ἐμὸν, καὶ ὁ σοι πείθεται ὁμοίως. *Orthod. fid. l. 3. c. 18. p. 250.*

(d) ὁ δὲ ἐνπελάμενος, ἐτέρῳ ἐντελεταί πνι. *Consil. Antioch. Sex Episc. Concil. To. 1. Ed. Lab. p. 845.* Alium dicam oportet, ex necessitate sensus, eum qui jubet & eum qui facit; nam nec juberet, si ipse faceret, dum juberet fieri per eum. Tamen jubebat, haud sibi iussurus, si unus esset; aut sine jussu facturum, quia non expectasset ut sibi juberet. *Tertul. adv. Praxeam. Cap. 12, 13.*

G

Now

Now can the same Individual Essence send, and Command itself? Or could our Lord absolutely deny That Doctrine to be his, which proceeded from his own numerical Essence? If *I and the Father are one*, signify *one in Essence*, it must signify *one in Action* also; and so, what one sends, the other must send; what one Commands, the other must Command; and the Doctrine which one teacheth, must be taught by the other also. Again, *The Works*, saith he, *which I do in my Fathers Name*, that is, by his Authority, *and the Works which my Father hath given me* (Power) *to do, they bear Witness of me*, John 5, 36. Now how can One of the same Individual Essence with the Father, act in *his Name*, and not in his *own* also? And lastly, *as the (e) Father hath taught me, so I speak*, John 8, 28; *and the Father hath not left me alone, for I do always the Things which are most pleasing to him*. Now can One of the same numerical Essence with the Father, be taught by another, and not by himself? Or can He do those Things which are pleasing to another, and not to himself?

— 3dly, One Individual Essence can give or deliver nothing to, and receive nothing from it self, because it can give nothing but what it

---

(e) ὡς παρὰ διδασκαλίαν παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ μεμαθήκει· ἔχον καὶ διδασκαλίαν ἐπιγέγραπτα ἡ πᾶσι, ἵνα ὡς ὁ πατὴρ διδάσκει αὐτὸν, οὕτως αὐτὸς διδάσκει τοὺς ἄλλους· καὶ ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ἐπέμψεν αὐτὸν ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς, οὕτως αὐτὸς ἐπέμψεν τοὺς ἄλλους ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς. πᾶσι δὲ ὡς καὶ ταῦτα ὁ πατὴρ ποιεῖ, οὕτως αὐτὸς ποιεῖ. Euseb. Eccles. Theol. 4. 1. Cap. 20. p. 90.

hath already, and therefore cannot receive by way of Gift. And this in an all-perfect and self-sufficient Being is the more certain, because it is incapable of any Accession to it's absolute Perfection. If then God the Son hath the same numerical Essence which the Father hath, He could not properly and truly say, *Matt. 11, 27, (f) All things are Delivered to me by my Father.* For, what could the Father either give, or reveal to his own Essence; which it had not, or did not know before? and again, *Matt. 28, 18, All Power is given to me in Heaven and in Earth:* Seeing the same Essence must have always the same Power. *Luke 1; 31, 32, The Angel speaketh to the Blessed Virgin thus; Thou shalt Conceive in thy Womb, and bear a Son, and shalt call his Name Jesus; He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Most High, and the Lord God shall give him the Throne of his Father David.* Now if the *Blessed Virgin* were, as some say, *θεοτοκος*, the *Mother of God*, by bringing forth one who was God of the same numerical Essence with the Father; then 1<sup>st</sup>, This must be a very mean Description of him, *He shall be Great, and shall be called the Son of the Most High*, not because He hath the Essence of the

(f) Τὸ ὅτι παρ' ἑτέρου λαμβάνων τὴν ἐκείνου οὐ δύναται νοεῖται  
*Euseb. Eccles. Theol. l. 3, c. 4. p. 15:* A quo illi tradita sunt, si unus est pater, & filius ejus? Quare habere non poterat, nisi tradita illi fuissent; si per omnia patri suo fuisset aequalis? nam significatio traditionis, tam unitatis rationem quam aequalitatis excludit. Nam nec qui accipit, unus esse cum dante; nec qui traditum accipit, aequalis est ei qui tradidit. *Opus imperf. in Matth. p. 97.*



Father, but, as the Angel saith, because *the Holy Spirit shall come upon her, and the Power of the Most High shall over-shadow her*, v. 35. 2dly, Why is it said that the *Lord God shall give to him*, (the same Lord God,) *the Throne of his Father David*? This Throne being given by That Lord God, who is one and the same in Father, and Son; must be given by himself, as That Lord God, to his Humane Nature, which alone he derived from his Father David. *The Father, saith the Baptist, loveth the Son, and hath given all Things into his hands*, Joh. 3, 35. to That Son, who came down from Heaven, hath he given all Things; not by Communication of his own numerical Essence to him, but from that Affection which he bore to him. So again, *Jesus knowing that the Father had given all Things into his hands, and that he came down from Heaven, washed the Disciples Feet*, John 13, 3: And yet if he that came down from Heaven, had the same numerical Essence with the Father; he must give all Things into his own Hands, or give it to Him who always had it. *John 5, 22, The Father judgeth no Man, but hath committed all Judgment to the Son*: If this relate to the *Divine Essence*, which is the same in Father and Son, he must give this Judgment to his own Essence; and the Action of the Son in Judging, must be the Action of the Father also; and so it could not be truly said, *the Father judgeth no Man*. If it relate to the *Humane Nature*; That being *Hypostatically* united to the Divine Nature, (and by That Nature only can he judge

the

the Secrets of Mens Hearts,) the Objection still returns in it's full Force. Chap. 17, 2, Thou (Father v. 1,) hast given him (thy Son, v. 1,) Power over all Flesh, that he may give Eternal Life to all that thou hast given him : An Earthly parent may give the Power to his Son to give Gratuities to his Servants committed to him, because he is in Essence numerically distinct from him ; but were they numerically One in Essence, the Power of Both must be One ; and what was given, must be given by Both. Lastly, Christ answers thus to the Sons of Zebedee, Matth. 20, 25, To sit on my Right Hand, and on my Left, (g) is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them, for whom it is prepared of my Father : And yet where the Essence is one and the same, the Gift must proceed from the same Essence in Both, and be prepared for them to whom it is given by Both.

4thly, The same numerical Essence cannot send itself or be sent from itself ; it cannot go from, and return to it self. And yet how frequently doth our Lord inform us, that (b)

---

(g) Inter eum cuius non est, & inter eum cuius est, nec persona una est, nec æqualis potestas. Si pater & filius Unus est, certè aut potest filius, aut non potest pater. *Opus imperf. in Mat. Ho. 35. p. 128.*

(b) Bonum placitum Patris, filius perficit ; mittit enim Pater, mittitur & venit filius. *Iren. l. 4. c. 14.* Sic & Pater alius a filio, dum filio major, dum alius qui generat, alius qui generatur ; Alius qui Mittit, alius qui mittitur. *Tertull. adv. Praxeam c. 9.* Missum se esse dicit, ut per hanc obedientiam qua venit Dominus Christus Missus, non Pater, sed filius probetur ; qui Mississet utiq ; si Pater fuisset ; missus autem non fuit Pater, ne pater Alteri Deo subditus, dum mittitur, probaretur. *Novatian Cap. 23.* πῶς δὲ ἀχώριστος ὢν τῷ πατρί, ἰαυτὸν ἔλεγεν ἐπιστάλδαι ; *Euseb. Eccles. Theolog. l. 1. c. 20. p. 26.* & plenius, *l. 2. c. 7. p. 110.*

*the Father had sent him into the World, and that  
 he came forth from the Father, and came into the  
 World. To select a few of his Sayings: He that  
 receiveth you, receiveth me; and he that receiveth  
 me, receiveth him that sent me, Matth. 10, 40. Joh.  
 13, 20, He that despiseth you, despiseth me;  
 and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent  
 me: In which Words there seems to be a plain  
 Gradation from the Lesser to the Greater. He  
 that receiveth me, receiveth not me, but him that  
 sent me, Mark 9, 37: He that believeth in me,  
 believeth not in me, but in him that sent me, John  
 12. 14. Could this Negation be truly spoken  
 by one and the same God with him that sent  
 him? Is not the Import of these Words plain-  
 ly this: He receiveth or believeth, not on-  
 ly in me his Messenger speaking in his Name,  
 but in That God who sent me with his Message?  
 Is not this his own Interpretation, when he  
 saith, *the Word which you hear, is not mine, but  
 the Fathers which sent me, John 14, 24?* And  
 is not this the Import of the like Phrases, used  
 both in the Old and New Testament? as when  
 it is said, *Exod. 16, 8, Your Murmurings are  
 not against us, but against the Lord. 1 Sam. 8,  
 7, They have not rejected thee, but they have re-  
 jected me. 1 Thess. 4. 8, He that despiseth our  
 Commandment, despiseth not Man, but God.*  
 Again, Chap. 8. 17, 18, *Christ speaketh thus;  
 In your Law it is written, the Testimony of two  
 Men is true; I am one that bear witness of my  
 self, and the Father that sent me, beareth witness  
 of me. Now doth not Christ here produce  
 himself,**



himself, and his Father, as two Witnesses of the Truth of his Mission? Whereas if he was numerically one in Essence and consequently in Action with the Father, this could not be the Testimony of two Witnesses, as is that of two Men, but of One only; nor could the Father bear Witness to his Son, but the Son would be the same Witness also. So (i) John 10, 37, *Say you of him whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the World, thou Blasphemest, because I said I am the Son of God?* From this Answer it is evident: 1<sup>st</sup>, That they accused our Lord of Blasphemy, not for saying, v. 30, *I and the Father are one*, but for styling God his Father, and so in effect saying He was the Son of God; for This is the Reason of that Accusation which our Lord here speaks of. 2<sup>dly</sup>, Our Lord here proves himself to be the Son of God, because the *Father had sanctified him, and sent him into the World*; whereas he who hath one numerical Essence with the Father, must do the same Action which the Father doth, and so (\*\*\*) must sanctifie himself, and send himself into the World. 3<sup>dly</sup>, He proves himself to be

---

(i) Sanctificatum se a Deo Patre proponit. Dum ergo sanctificationem accipit a Patre, minor Patre est; minor autem patre consequenter, sed filius. Pater enim si fuisset, sanctificationem dedisset, non accepisset. Nunc autem, profitendo se accepisse sanctificationem a Patre; hoc ipso, quo patre se minorem accipiendo ab ipso sanctificationem probat; filium se esse, non patrem, monstravit. Novatian. c. 22.

(\*\*) Ita Damascenus. Ἀυτὸς ἐκ τὸν ἔχειον, χελων μὲν ὡς θεὸς τὸ σῶμα τῇ θεότητι αὐτοῦ, χελωνικός δὲ ὡς ἀνθρώπος· αὐτὸς δὲ ἰσχυρὸς κατέχει. χελωνίς δὲ ἡ θεότης τῇ ἀνθρωπότητι. De orthod. fide l. 3. c. 3. p. 172.

the

the Son of God, because he did the Works of his Father; for so it immediately follows, v. 38, *If I do not the Works of my Father, believe me not to be his Son.* Now these Works, saith he, v. 25, *I do ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς in my Father's Name*, that is, not by my own, but by his Authority, and Power; whereas he who is numerically one in Essence with the Father, must do his works by one and the same Authority and Power.

5thly, No numerical Essence can do an Action † by another; for where the Essence is the same, the Action must proceed from the same Essence, and so not be done by another. And yet it is expressly said, *Eph. 3, 9, that God created all things by Jesus Christ; that by him he made the Worlds, Heb. 1, 2; That God will judge the secrets of Men by Jesus Christ, Rom. 2, 15. He that raised up the Lord Jesus Christ, shall raise us up also by Jesus, 2 Cor. 4, 14. It pleased the Father by him to reconcile all things to himself, Col. 1; 19, 20.* For the same Reason, we could not, upon this Supposition, properly be said to have things from God, or to do things to God, by Christ: To have Peace with God by our Lord Jesus Christ, and to rejoice in God, *διὰ* by or through our

---

† Πῶς δὲ καὶ τὸ, πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, χάριν ἔχει, ἐνδὲς ὅπου τὸ ὑποκειμένον; Eusebius Eccles. Theol. l. 2. c. 14. p. 122. Alius a quo omnia, alius per quem omnia. Tertul. adv. Praxeam Cap. 21. πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, ἵνα μὴ πᾶσι νοήσῃ, αὐτὸ δὲ διακρινόμενον. Euseb. ibid. vid. & l. 1. c. 20. p. 84.

Lord Jesus Christ, Rom. 5. 11, 11. To the only  
 wise God be Glory, &c. by our Lord Jesus Christ,  
 Rom. 16. 27. Thanks be to God who hath given  
 us the Victory, &c. by our Lord Jesus Christ,  
 1 Cor. 15. 57. Such hope have we to God, by  
 Christ, 2 Cor. 3. 4. We are filled with those  
 fruits of Righteousness which are by Jesus Christ,  
 to the Glory of God the Father, Philip. 1. 11.  
 We gave thanks *οὐκ ἑαυτοῖς*; to God, even the  
 Father, by him, Coloss. 3. 17. We offer up Spi-  
 ritual Sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus  
 Christ, 1 Pet. 2. 5. That God in all things may  
 be Glorified through Jesus Christ, Chap. 4. 11.  
 Now if Christ be the same only-wise God, act-  
 ing by the same individual Essence; can Glory  
 be given to him by our Lord, and not by him-  
 self? Can we be filled with the fruits of  
 Righteousness by him to the Glory of God the Fa-  
 ther, and not equally to his own Glory? Can  
 our Sacrifices be acceptable to God by him, and  
 not also to him? or, Can God in all things be  
 Glorified by him, and he not be Glorified by  
 himself? By him, saith St. Paul, Heb. 13. 15;  
 let us offer up our Sacrifices of praise to God  
 always. And if he be the same Individual God,  
 must they not be offered also to Him? *vid.* to

6thly. No Numerical Essence can (i) pray,  
 or give thanks to its self for any thing; for so  
 it

(i) *δοξάζει τὸν αὐτὸν πατέρα, ὃ καὶ εὐχαριστᾷ ἐμπροσθέν, καὶ  
 ὑπακούει.* — *Ὁ δὲ ἀπὸ πάντων ἐπεὶ ἐὰν τὸν τὸν πατέρα δόξωμεν.*  
 Euseb. Eccles. Theol. l. 2. c. 10. Juxta Sabellium, αὐτὸς ἑαυ-  
 τὸν εὐχαριστᾷ αὐτὸν καὶ ἐμπροσθέν λέγων ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ. *ibid.* cap. 12,  
 p. 119. Hinc Damascenus negat Christum proprie orasse: Est enim



it must pray for that, which it must do it self; and give thanks to its self for that which is done by its self. Now, To omit his Prayer to God in the Mount, mentioned *Math. 14, 23*: His continuance in prayer to God all the Night, *Luke 6, 12*: His Prayer to his Father thrice repeated, *to be delivered from the bitter Cup*, *Luke 22, 22*: his strong Cryes and tears, mentioned by *St. Paul*, *Heb. 5, 7*, to him that was able to save: (All which, according to that Doctrine, which saith that He who thus prayed was God of the same individual Essence with That God he prayed to, must be Prayers offered to himself.) *Math. 26, 44*, He speaks to *Simon Peter* Thrice; *Simon, I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not*: To whom did he pray, if he were individually one and the same God with him to whom He prayed? or, Why did he pray thus, if the Assistance which preserv'd his Faith from failing, was his own; as it must be, if he had one and the same Essence with him to whom he pray'd? *Ver. 59*, He speaks to the same person thus; *Cannot I pray to the Father, and he shall send me more than twelve legions of Angels?* Now to whom should He pray, who is one in Essence with the Father? or, Why should he pray for the Assistance of Angels, who had them as much in his power as the Father had? *John 14, 16*, He speaks to

---

(inquit) oratio, ascensio mentis ad Deum, aut decentium a Deo petitio. Quomodo ergo Dominus in suscitacione Lazari, & Passionis tempore orabat? ὅτι ὁ ἀναστάσιος τῆς πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἐστὶ τοῦ ἀγίου αὐτῷ νῦν, ἀπαρὰ καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ Θεῷ ἀναστῶν ἐν τῷ ἵσθι ὁ χριστός.

his

his Disciples thus, *I will ask the Father, and He shall Give you another Comforter*; Why should he ask what he himself must Give? or, Why doth he say, *He shall Give*, if not to distinguish himself from the Giver of the Comforter, whom he promiseth to send to them from the Father?

To proceed to his Thanksgivings. *Math. 11, 25, (\*\*)* *Father, saith He, I thank thee, Lord of heaven and earth, that (when) thou hast bid these things from the wise and prudent, thou hast revealed them to babes; for so it seemeth good in thy sight.* Now why doth He, who is numerically one with the Father, and so the same Lord of Heaven and Earth, thus distinguish himself from him? or, Is this the Import of these words, *I who am lord of heaven and earth, thank thee the same Lord of heaven and earth?* Why doth He thank him for doing That, which He, being the same God, must do? or say that this was done because it was well pleasing to his Father, rather than to himself? *John 11, 41, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me, and I know that thou bearest me always;* Now why should the same God either Give thanks, or pray to the same God, or give him thanks on this account that He had heard him?

---

(\*\*) Non posse unum eundemque videri, qui loquitur, & de quo loquitur, & ad quem loquitur. *Tertull. adv. Prax. cap. 11.*

7thly. One Numerical Essence can do nothing (4) in the *Name* of another, because it cannot be another from it self; Nor can we ask any thing to be done by the Father in the Name of his Son, or for his sake, if He hath the same Essence, and doth the same Action, with the Father. And yet Christ often speaks to his Disciples thus; *Whatsoever you shall ask the Father in my Name, I will do it*, John 14; 13, 14. *Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my Name, he will give it you*, John 15, 16. And again; *Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my Name, He shall give it to you*, Chap. 16, 23. The Son therefore doth it by asking the Father to do it for them; so John 14, 16, *I will ask the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter*; And Chap. 16; 26, 27, *Ye shall ask in my Name, and I say not that I will ask the Father for you*, αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ, for he, even the Father loveth you. Now as these words shew a plain, numerical, Distinction betwixt the Father and the Son; so must this necessarily be supposed where one asks, and the other gives; for where the Essence is one, the Action must proceed, from one and the same Person, He having only one and the same Essence to act by.

---

(†) Deniq; dicit, Ego veni in Patris mei nomine, & non me recepistis; Adeo filius erat in Dei & Regis & Domini Omnipotentis & Altissimi nomine. Tertull, adv. Praxeam, cap. 21. ὅρα δὲ πῶς τὸ ποῦν καὶ νῦν αὐτὸς ὁ κλεινὸς κατὰ τὰς ἐν νεφελῇ, καὶ τῷ Μωσῇ παρὰ τὰς ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου, ἔπερσεν παρ' ἑαυτὸν συνήδας κατὰ ἀναδιπλωσιν δις κύνειον ἐπιχαλυμένον, ὡς εἴη καὶ ἑαυτὸς καὶ ὁ ἴσους λοιπῶν ἀπάντων θεολογούμενον, ὃ ἑαυτὸς πατὴρ, &c. Euseb. Dem. Evangel. l. 5. c. 17. p. 243.



8thly. This may be concluded both from the Words and Actions of Christ himself: For 1st, In his Prayer to his Father He speaks thus, John 17, 3, *This is life eternal, in verbum, that all flesh, v. 7, should know thee* (who art) *the only true God, and (should also know) him whom thou hast sent, to wit, Jesus Christ.* "Whereas" faith (k) Dr. Clark, if the word *μὸνός* only, or "alone, doth not appropriate the word *true God* "to the Father, to whom alone our Lord here "speaks; there is no word in any Language which "can appropriate any Thing to any Subject."

2dly. The words, *and him whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ*; cannot be predicated of God the Father, or of him who is of the same individual Essence with the Father; *For the Father sends, but is not sent, (l) least by being sent He should be proved subject to another God.* 3dly. Because this Sense agrees not with the Context; it being incongruous to introduce the same true God, praying, v. 1, that His Father; i. e. the same true God, would *Glorify him*; and that He would do this, that He, the same true God, might Glorify the same God; or that He might from him receive again *That Glory which He had with him before the world began.* These words plainly require two distinct Persons; the one giving, the other receiving Glory, and having it with him. So again, *Math. 19, 17, Christ speaks to the*

---

(k) Reply to Mr. Nelson. p. 60.

(l) Pater enim mittit, non mittitur; ne subditus alteri Deo, cum mittitur, probaretur. Novatianus de Trinit. cap. 23.

Young Man thus; *Why callest thou me Good, there is none Good, but one, that is, God: God, even the Father*, as these words are Cited by (m) Justin, Irenæus, and Clemens Alexandrimis in the Second; by Origen, and Novatian in the Third Century; they all agreeing with Dr. Clark, that the word &c. here signifies *one Person*. Now I ask the Question, Whether Christ by these words intended to exclude himself from having the same Numerical Goodness with the Father, or he did not: If he did intend this, 'tis certain that he had not the same Numerical Essence with the Father, since one and the same Essence must have one and the same Goodness: If he did not intend this, why doth he use those words which plainly seem to exclude him from the same Goodness? for these words, *there is none Good, but one, that is God, even the Father*, are an Exceptive Proposition; and therefore by the Rules of Logick 'tis to be resolved into these Two, *God, the Father, is good; and none besides him is good.*

Again, when he saith, *Mark 13, 32, (n) of that day and hour knoweth no person, neither the*

(m) Justin. Dial. p. 328. Irenæus l. 1. c. 17. Clemens Alex. Stro. 7. p. 733. Origen Com. in Johan. p. 28. 60. contr. celsum, l. 5. p. 239. Exhort. ad Martyr. p. 109. Novatian, cap. 4.

(n) Ipse filius Dei ipsum judicii diem & horam concessit scire solum patrem. Iren. l. 2. c. 28. Et c. 29, in omnibus communicans pater filio, solus scire horam & diem a Domino manifestatus est, ut discamus per ipsum super omnia esse patrem; etenim *Pater*, ait, *major me est*: & secundum agnitionem itaq; præpositus esse Pater annuntiatus est à Domino. vide Tertull. adv. Praxeam, c. 20. Pseudo-Greg. Recogn. l. 10. n. 14.

*Angels in Heaven, nor the Son, but the Father ; Math. 24, 36, no person but ὁ πατήρ μόνος my Father only.* Here again is an exceptive Proposition, to be resolved into these two ; *The Father knoweth of that Day, and he alone knoweth of that Day.* Nor could our Lord have absolutely said, *no Person knoweth of that Day, no not the Son,* if, tho' the Son knew it not according to his Humane Nature, or as he was a Prophet, yet he knew it as He was that Person who was God and Man.

Moreover, our Saviour saith, *Math. 27, 46, (ο) My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* and sends this Message to his Disciples, *I ascend to my Father, and your Father, to my God, and your God.* And *Revel. 3, 12, Him that overcometh will I make a Pillar in the Temple of my God, and I will write upon him the name of my God, and of the City of my God.* Now these words being spoken by that very Person who was God and Man, must either argue that he had a God superior to himself, or that he was so God of God, as to have the individual Essence of God the Father Communicated to him ; which, say *Dr. Clark* and *Mr. Jackson* is a thing Impossible ; since no Individual Essence can be Communicated, because it is Individual ; and because it implies this Contradiction, that the same Individual must be generated by being Communi-

---

(ο) Patrem suum Christus μόνον ἀληθινόν Θεόν ἡγήσασθαι ἡμᾶς διδάσκει, μείζονα τὸ εἶναι ἑαυτὴν ὁμολογεῖν, ὃν καὶ Θεόν εἶναι ἑαυτὴν πάντας ἡμᾶς οἰδέναι βέβαιον, *Euseb. Eccles. Theol. l. 1. c. 11. p. 70. τὸν μόνον ἐκ πατρὸς ἀληθινόν Θεόν, Orig. Contr. Cels. l. 3. p. 133.*



cated to the Son, and *ungenerated* as it is in the Father. And John 14, 1, *You believe in God, believe also in me*; whereas, were He the same Numerical God with the Father, it would be impossible to believe in the one, and not in the other also.

For the same Reason the Argument is strong, and conclusive, from all those places in the Epistles, in which the Father is stiled *his God*: As when the *Apostle* exhorts us *with one mind and mouth, to Glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, Rom. 15; 5, 6. when he saith, Eph. 1, 3, *Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*; and v. 17, *the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of Glory, give you Wisdom*. Col. 1, 3, *we give thanks to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*; and 1 Pet. 1, 3, *blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*. For if these words are not capable of the latter Sense, they must be understood in the former; that is, if he be not another in Essence from the Father, he must be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that is, of himself. Further,

It is observable that Christ being thrice accused of Blasphemy for making himself *equal with God*, or for Doing that which the *Jews* thought belonged to God alone to Do, He never directly answers, *That he was God, or equal to him*, (as, if he was sent to teach That Doctrine to the World, it was reasonable to expect, upon these occasions, He would have done;) but still so speaks, as one that waved that Assertion. For when the

Scribes

Scribes enquire, why doth this Man *say* speak blasphemy? who can forgive Sins, but one, that is, God? Mark 2. 7: he doth not answer; as (p) *Irenæus*, *Novatian*, and others do for him, that this proved him to be God; but only saith, *the Son of Man had power upon earth to forgive* (the temporal Punishment of) *Sin*, v. 10. ascribing to himself this Power, not as he was the Son of God, much less as being God of the same Substance with the Father, but only as he was the Son of Man. Again; from these words, *John* 5, 17, *My Father worketh hitherto*, Works of Providential Care, Goodness and Mercy; and these Charitable actions *I work also*: From these words, I say, from his calling God his Father in so peculiar manner (as he did, and had just Cause to do, had he been only Miraculously conceived in the Virgin's Womb, and upon That account the Son of God, *Luke* 1, 35; the Son of the most high, v. 32;) they Invidiously infer, ver. 18, that he called God *πατήρ ἰσθρ*, i. e. his Father in such a proper Sense as made him equal to God, as a Son is to his Father. Now to this, Christ doth not answer, as it might have been expected from one who was sent into the World to confirm that Doctrine; to wit, that he had reason thus to call God his Father, as being of the same Individual Essence with him; but his Answer contains many things seemingly inconsistent with that Doctrine. For his Reply is,

---

(p) *Iren.* l. 5. c. 17. p. 426. *Novatian* cap. 13.

That he (q) could do nothing of himself, v. 19 and 30; that the Father judgeth no Man, but had given all judgment to the Son, v. 22. and That, because He was the Son of Man, v. 27. That he sought not his own will, but the will of his Father that sent him, v. 30. That the Father which sent him, ~~was~~ He was the Person that bore witness of him, v. 37. and that he came not in his own, but in his Fathers Name, v. 43. and lastly, that the Works which his Father had given him (power) to do, bore witness of him, that the Father had sent him, v. 36. All which sayings, are plainly inconsistent with an Identity of Essence, Will, and Actions in God the Father, and the Son. In the 10th Chap. they accuse him of Blasphemy, not for saying, v. 30, *I and the Father are one*, but, as Christ himself declares, v. 36, *because he said I am the Son of God*: And yet He being accused of Blasphemy, *because He being a Man made himself God*, had reason to reply, had it been true, that being God of the same Essence with the Father, by representing himself as God, he only told them the truth: Whereas He only proves himself to be the Son of God, (1st.) Because the Father had (r) *Sanctified him, and sent him into*

---

(q) Ex his omnibus probat Eusebius, filium *ἐπεὶ αὐτὸς τὸ πα-  
τερος*. *Eccles. Theol. l. 1. c. 11 p. 70. l. 2. c. 7. p. 11.*

(r) Distinctionem posuit Dominus in ratione reddenda quomodo se Deum dixisset quem Pater Sanctificavit; dum enim accipit Sanctificationem a Patre, minor Patre est; minor autem patre est consequenter, sed filius. *Novatian cap. 22.*



*the World*; whereas it is absurd to say, he either *Sanctified*, or *sent into the World* his own Numerical Essence. And 2dly, Because he did the Works of his Father, v. 37; to wit, by Virtue of That Power which the Father had given him to do them, *John* 5, 36; and by the Spirit of his Father dwelling in him: For he did them *by the Spirit of God*, *Matth.* 12, 28; *by the Finger of God*, *Luke* 11, 20; *by the Father in Him*, as He was in the *Apostles*, and *they in him*, *John* 14, 20; and who were in the Father and the Son, as the Father was in the Son, and the Son in the Father, *John* 17; 21, 22, 23.

9thly. The *Apostles*, both from their preaching, and their Writings, afford just ground to suspect the truth, or at least the necessity of this Doctrine. For

1st. The Acts of the *Apostles* give us a full History of the Conversion of Myriads both of *Jews* and *Gentiles* to the *Christian Faith*; and yet *St. Peter*, and *St. Paul*, the great Instruments of their Conversion, say not one Word to engage *Christians* to believe that *Christ* was *God of the same individual Essence with the Father*; but they say many things which seem repugnant to it. *St. Peter* in his first Sermon declares *Jesus Christ* was a Person demonstrated to be come from God, by the Miracles which *involve* *Dei* *in* *Deo*, *God did by him*, *Acts* 2, 22. Now can it be said of One of the same Numerical Essence with God, that he came from God, or that God did

*Miracles by him, or that (f) God had made him Lord and Christ, v. 36? Chap. the 3d, He is the Holy one, the Child of God, the Prince of Life, whom the God of Abraham had raised up, and Glorified, v. 13, 14, 15. In the Prayers of the whole Church, they speak thus to God; The Rulers were gathered together against thee, and thy Holy Child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed; Grant therefore that signs and wonders may be done by the name of thy holy Child Jesus, Chap. 4. 27, 30. Chap. the 10th, St. Peter gives this Description of him to Cornelius, and those that were with him; that God had anointed him with the Holy Ghost, and with Power, (or with the Power of the Holy Ghost,) and that he therefore went about doing good, and healing all that were possessed of the Devil, for that God was with him. That he was Lord of all, and was by God appointed to be the judge of the Quick and the Dead, v. 37--42. Which words show plainly that he could not be of the same Individual Essence with That God, who anointed him with the Holy Ghost, was with him, and appointed him to be the Judge of all Men. St. Paul being Converted, declareth Christ to be the Son of God, Act. 9, 20. the Christ, Act. 17, 3. That just one, Act. 22, 14. And the Eunuch was baptized by virtue of That Faith, that Jesus was the Son of God. If then the belief of the Numerical I-*

---

(f) Est Altissimus, quæ dexterâ Dei exaltatus; sicut Petrus in actis Apostolorum concionatur. Tertull. adv. Praxeam cap. 17.

identity of God the Father, and the Son, in Essence, Will, and Actions, be necessary to Salvation; Why was it not Then as fully and expressly taught, as it is Now? Why were these Great *Apostles* so silent in a thing so necessary? Was either *Sabellius*, or the *Compiler of the Athanasian Creed* wiser than these *Apostles*, or more faithful in the Discharge of their Office? If not, whence comes this signal Difference betwixt that which the *Apostles* taught Then, and these Men have taught since?

2ly. There be very many Passages in their Epistles, which cannot well be reconciled with the Doctrine of the Unity in Essence, Will, and Actions of God the Father and the Son. For

1st. It is not easy to reconcile this Doctrine with those Expressions which so often stile St. Paul the *Apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God*, 1 Cor. 1; 1, 2; Eph. 1, 1; Coloss. 1, 1; 2 Tim. 1, 1; or Paul the *Apostle by the (t) commandment of God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ*, 1 Tim. 1, 1. Paul the *Servant of God, and the Apostle of our Lord Jesus Christ*, Tit. 1, 1. For, where the Essence is one; the Will, and the Command, must be one also.

2ly. The same further appears from Christ's being stiled the *Image of God*. Thus the Gospel is stiled the *Gospel of the Glory of Christ who is the Image of God*, 2 Cor. 4, 4. because that God who caused

---

(t) Πρόδικλον ὃς ὡς ὁ λόγον, ἑτέρω λέγει, καὶ ὁ ἐντελλόμενος, ἑτέρω παρ' ἑαυτὸν ἐντέλλεται. Euseb. Dem. Evang. l. 5, c. 5. p. 229.



light to shine out of Darkness, hath shined into our hearts, to give us the light of his glorious knowledge *ἐν προσώπῳ* in the person of Jesus Christ, v. 6. He is the Image of the Invisible God, Col. 1, 15. (u) For tho' an Image may be like to the Exemplar, it never can be the Exemplar it self.

3dly. From those Places which say that such a thing was done by Jesus Christ, or such Honour was confer'd upon him, to the Glory of God, the Father. As, when we are said to be filled with the fruits of Righteousness which are thro' Jesus Christ, to the Glory of God, the Father, Philip. 1, 11. and that God had exalted him (who being in the form of God, took upon him the form of a Servant) and given him a Name above every name, that at the Name of Jesus every Knee should bow, and every Tongue confess that Jesus was the Lord, to the Glory of God, the Father, Chap. 2; 9, 10. 11. For nothing can be done by, or conferred on, him who is one in Essence with God the Father, to the Glory of God the father. So Rom. 15, 7, Christ hath received us to the Glory of God; and Chap. 16, 27, To the only wise God be Glory thro' our Lord Jesus Christ; That God in all things may be glorified by Jesus Christ, 1 Pet. 4, 11. Now, seeing *actiones sunt essentialium reipsa existentium*,

(u) ὁ δὲ πατὴρ ὃν εἰκότι καὶ τὸ ὅτι εἰκότι, ἐν καὶ ταύτων ἐμμορφῆται, ἀλλὰ  
 ὁ δὲ πατὴρ ὁμοῖος, καὶ ὁμογενής, καὶ ὁμοσυνουσίος. Euseb. contra  
 Marcell. l. 1. c. 4. p. 25. Invisibilis Dei imaginem ait Christum; sed  
 nos enim invisibilem dicimus patrem Christi; Sciens filium semper  
 retrò visum, si quibus visus est in Dei nomine, ut imaginem ipsius.  
 Tertull. contr. Marcion. l. 5. c. 19. p. 484.

where the singular Essence is one and the same; the Action must be the same; and so cannot be said to be done by one of the same Essence, to another of the same Essence.

4thly. This seems not reconcilable to those many Texts, which put a plain and great Distinction, betwixt God the Father, and the Son. As when it is said, Rom. 8, 17, *Heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ.* That he that in these things serveth Christ, is acceptable to God, Rom. 14, 18. that all things are of God, reconciling us to himself, thro' our Lord Jesus Christ, 2 Cor. 5, 18, 19. That we Christians worship God in Spirit, and rejoyce in Christ Jesus, Eph. 3, 3. And have the knowledge of the Mystery of God, to wit the Father, and of Christ, Col. 2, 2. I pray that your heart may be established before God, the Father, at the Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, 1 Thes. 3, 13. I testify before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Elect Angels, 1 Tim. 5, 21; 6, 13; and 2 Tim. 4, 1. He is able to save to the uttermost those that come to God by him, Heb. 7, 25. We are come to God the judge of all, and to Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant, Heb. 12, 24. Christ hath once suffer'd for our Sins, that He might bring us to God, 1 Pet. 3, 18. St. Jude also writes to them who are sanctified by God the Father, and kept by Jesus Christ, v. 1.

5thly. This still more visibly appears from that plain Distinction which is put betwixt God the Father, and the Son, sometimes by way of Gradation, as in these words; *All are yours, for you are of Christ, [or are Christ's] and Christ is of God.* Now we are Christ's, as being Members  
of

of That Body of which he is the Head, and Subjects of That Kingdom of which he is the Lord; but yet with great Inferiourity in Nature: And therefore it seems reasonable to conceive that these words, *Christ is of God*, should signify He is inferiour and subordinate to him; Especially if we add to them the Like words in the same Epistle, Chap. 11, 3. *The Head of the Woman is the Man, the Head of Man is Christ, the Head of Christ is God.* For the Ground of these gradations is plainly the Superiority and Dominion which the one hath over the other. And, saith St. Peter, we Christians believe in That God who hath raised Christ from the Dead, and given him Glory, that our Faith and Hope, of a blessed Resurrection, might be in God, 1 Pet. 1, 20: Even in That God, and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath begotten us to a lively hope of an Inheritance Incorruptible thro' the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ. Now He by whom we believe in God, is not the same God, in whom we believe. And if it be God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who glorified him; he cannot be of the same Essence with Him that glorified him; for then He must have glorified Himself.

6thly. This will be still more evident from the Distinction which the Apostles put betwixt The Father as our God, and Jesus Christ as our Lord. So 2 Cor. 8, 4, we know *id est unum deum non* other person that is God, but one; For tho' (among the Heathens) (x) There be many who are Called

---

(x) Origen Comm. in Joh. p. 47. Euseb. Eccles. Theol. l. 1. c. 6.



*Gods in Heaven and in Earth*, v. 5, yet to us (Christians) there is one God (only, to wit) the Father, of whom are all things, and we for him; and one Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him, v. 6. Now is not this sixth Verse a Confirmation of what is asserted v. 4, that there is no other Person who is God, but one? is not this a *diacritical* Distinction of one from the other; that the Father is he *from whom* are all things; and the Lord, He by whom are all things; God having made all things by Jesus Christ? That the Father is the one God of the Christians, Christ the one Lord of them? And whereas, in Answer to this, it is said that “as the *Apostle*, by saying there is one Lord, to wit, Jesus Christ, doth not exclude the Father from being also the Lord of the Christians, so neither by saying *there is one God, the Father*, ought He to be supposed to exclude Jesus Christ from being also the God of the *Christians*,” To this it is replied, 1<sup>st</sup>. That the Father is by these words excluded from being Lord in the same Sense in which Christ is in *Scripture* stiled Lord; for the Father neither is, nor can be, that Person whom God hath made both Lord and Christ, *Act*, 2, 36; or he whom all *Christians* must confess to be Lord, to the Glory of God the Father. 2<sup>dly</sup>. Dr. Clark thus answers: “That the Father’s being by way of Eminence the one God, does not exclude the Son from being truly God by true Communication of Divinity from that one unoriginated God the Father, I readily acknowledge: But to say that the one God the Father is the Son

“also, and not the Father only; or that the  
 “is not excluded from being That one  
 “which is the Person of the Father; this  
 “rectly affirming that two Persons are one  
 “the same Person, which is the utmost Con-  
 “fusion.” So again Eph. 4. *there is one Spirit*,  
 v. 4. *one Lord*, v. 5. *one God, and Father of all,*  
*who is above all*, ver. 6. To say here, that this  
 one God, and Father of all, is also That one  
 Spirit, and one Lord, as an Identity in Essence,  
 must suppose them to be, is plainly to confound  
 those whom the *Apostle* clearly doth distinguish  
 from each other; and to say that the Spirit of  
 God and of Christ, is the same as the God of  
 God and of Christ: And how then is he so  
 often said to be sent by God the Father, and by  
 Christ?

*Lastly*, This is evident from those places in  
 which they are put in Opposition, Exemption, or  
 Exclusion from each other: As in these words,  
*To the (2) only wise God, be Glory through*  
*Jesus Christ our Lord*, Rom. 16, 27. and 1 Tim,  
 6; 14, 15, 16, *I command thee before God who*  
*quickneth all things, that thou keep this Com-*  
*mandment unspotted till the appearing of the Lord*  
*Jesus Christ, which in its proper season He shall*  
*shew, who is the only potentate, who only hath im-*

---

(2) Ex his verbis contendit Eusebius, Ecclesiam non agnoscere  
 Duos Deos; sed docere μίαν ἀρχὴν, ἣ θεὸν εἶναι αὐτὸν πατέρα.  
 Et Apostolum hæc omnia dicere, οὗς θεολογίαν τῷ ἑνὶ καὶ ἐνὶ πα-  
 τρι θεῷ. *Euseb. Theol. l. 3. c. 23.*

*Univally.* Where the God who quickneth all things, is not only Distinguished from our Lord Jesus Christ, but is stiled *The only potentate, who only bath immortality*, that is, by a Description which in some eminent Sense must agree to Him alone. Finally, the *Apostle* saith, 1 Cor. 15, 26, *Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the Kingdom to God, even to him who is the Father;* for, v. 27, *He bath put all things under his feet: But when he saith, he bath put all things under his feet, it is manifest that He is excepted who did put all things under him. And v. 28, when all things shall be subdued to him, then shall the Son also himself be subject to him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.* Where the Descants of the *Post-Nicene Fathers* on these words, are sufficiently Confuted by Dr. *Whitby*. But when He paraphraseth the last words thus, *that God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost may be all in all*, he is himself mistaken; for the Son is to Deliver up the Kingdom to God the Father, v. 26. It is God the Father which is excepted, v. 27; and who said to him, *Sit thou on my right hand till I make all thine Enemies thy footstool*, Psal. 110, 1. It therefore must be God the Father, who then shall be all in all.

*Note*, I have added these Citations in the Margin from the *Fathers*, not to Confirm these Arguments by their Authority, but only to show the Agreement of the Sentiments of the *Primitive Fathers* with what is delivered, and the Antiquity of this Doctrine.

F I N I S,



---

---

## ADVERTISEMENT.

**A** Discourse, shewing that the Exposition, which the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers have given of the Texts alledg'd against Dr. *Clarke* by a Layman, are more agreeable to the Interpretations of Dr. *Clarke*, than to the Interpretations of that Learned Layman. Price 1 s.

The External Peace of the Church, only attainable by a Zeal for Scripture in its just Latitude; and by mutual Charity; not by a Pretense of Uniformity in Opinions. Pr. 1 s.

An Examination of Mr. Ny's Explication of the Articles of the Divine Unity, Trinity, and Incarnation. Pr. 1 s.

A Collection of Queries, wherein the most Material Objections from Scripture, Reason and Antiquity, which have been as yet objected against Dr. *Clarke's* Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, are proposed and Answered. Pr. 2 s.

Reflections on the present Controversy. Pr. 6 d.

Letter to a Friend in *Lancashire*. Pr. 3 d.

A Speech of a Member of the Constitution-Club at *Oxford*. Pr. 6 d.